arXiv:1011.5719v1 [math.CA] 26 Nov 2010

ESTIMATES FOR SINGULAR INTEGRALS ON HOMOGENEOUS GROUPS

SHUICHI SATO

Abstract. We consider singular integral operators and maximal singular integral operators with rough kernels on homogeneous groups. We prove certain estimates for the operators that imply L^p boundedness of them by an extrapolation argument under a sharp condition for the kernels. Also, we prove some weighted L^p inequalities for the operators.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be the n dimensional Euclidean space. We also regard $\mathbb{R}^n$ as a homogeneous group with multiplication given by a polynomial mapping. So, we have a dilation family $\{A_t\}_{t>0}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that each A_t is an automorphism of the group structure, where A_t is of the form

$$A_t x = (t^{a_1}x_1, t^{a_2}x_2, \dots, t^{a_n}x_n), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

with some real numbers $a_1, \dots, a_n$ satisfying $0 < a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \cdots \leq a_n$ (see [28] and [15, Section 2 of Chapter 1]). We also write $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{H}$. In addition to the Euclidean structure, $\mathbb{H}$ is equipped with a homogeneous nilpotent Lie group structure, where Lebesgue measure is a bi-invariant Haar measure, the identity is the origin 0, $x^{-1} = -x$ and multiplication xy, $x, y \in \mathbb{H}$, satisfies

(1) (ux)(vx)= ux+vx, $x \in \mathbb{H}$, $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$;
(2) $A_t(xy) = (A_t x)(A_t y)$, $x, y \in \mathbb{H}$, $t > 0$;
(3) if $z = xy$, then $z_k = P_k(x, y)$, where $P_1(x, y) = x_1 + y_1$ and $P_k(x, y) = x_k + y_k + R_k(x, y)$ for $k \geq 2$ with a polynomial $R_k(x, y)$ depending only on $x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, y_1, \dots, y_{k-1}$.

We denote by $|x|$ the Euclidean norm for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Also, we have a norm function $r(x)$ satisfying $r(A_t x) = t r(x)$ for $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We assume the following:

(4) the function r is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and smooth in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$;
(5) $r(x+y) \leq C_0(r(x)+r(y))$, $r(xy) \leq C_0(r(x)+r(y))$ for some constant $C_0 \geq 1$, $r(x^{-1}) = r(x)$;

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42B20.
Key Words and Phrases. Singular integrals, homogeneous groups.

(6) there are positive constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1$ and β_2 such that

$$c_1|x|^{\alpha_1} \le r(x) \le c_2|x|^{\alpha_2} \quad \text{if } r(x) \ge 1,$$
$$c_3|x|^{\beta_1} \le r(x) \le c_4|x|^{\beta_2} \quad \text{if } r(x) \le 1;$$

(7) if $\Sigma = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : r(x) = 1\}$, then $\Sigma = S^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| = 1\}$.

Let $\gamma = a_1 + \cdots + a_n$. Then, $dx = t^{\gamma-1}\, dS\, dt$, that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)\, dx = \int_0^\infty \int_\Sigma f(A_t\theta)t^{\gamma-1}\, dS(\theta)\, dt$$

for an appropriate function f with $dS = \omega\, dS_0$, where ω is a strictly positive C^∞ function on Σ and dS_0 is the Lebesgue surface measure on Σ. For appropriate functions f, g on $\mathbb{H}$, the convolution $f * g$ is defined by

$$f * g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y)g(y^{-1}x)\, dy.$$

The space $\mathbb{H}$ with a left invariant quasi-metric $d(x, y) = r(x^{-1}y)$ can be regarded as a space of homogeneous type (see [2, 8, 11, 15, 18, 26, 27, 28] for more details).

The Heisenberg group $\mathbb{H}_1$ is an example of a homogeneous group. If we define the multiplication

$$(x, y, u)(x', y', u') = (x + x', y + y', u + u' + (xy' - yx')/2),$$

$(x, y, u), (x', y', u') \in \mathbb{R}^3$, then $\mathbb{R}^3$ with this group law is the Heisenberg group $\mathbb{H}_1$; a dilation is defined by $A_t(x, y, u) = (tx, ty, t^2u)$.

Let Ω be locally integrable in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and homogeneous of degree 0 with respect to the dilation group $\{A_t\}$, that is, $\Omega(A_tx) = \Omega(x)$ for $x \ne 0$, $t > 0$. We assume that

$$\int_\Sigma \Omega(\theta)\, dS(\theta) = 0.$$

Let $K(x) = \Omega(x')r(x)^{-\gamma}$, $x' = A_{r(x)^{-1}}x$ for $x \ne 0$. For $s \ge 1$, let d_s denote the collection of measurable functions h on $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : t > 0\}$ satisfying

$$\|h\|_{d_s} = \sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \left(\int_{2^j}^{2^{j+1}} |h(t)|^s\, dt/t \right)^{1/s} < \infty,$$

where $\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the set of integers. We define $\|h\|_{d_\infty} = \|h\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)}$. Note that $d_s \subset d_u$ if $s \ge u$. Also, put for $t \in (0, 1]$, @

$$\omega(h, t) = \sup_{|s|<tR/2} \int_R^{2R} |h(r - s) - h(r)|\, dr/r,$$

where the supremum is taken over all s and R such that $|s| < tR/2$ (see [12, 25]). For $\eta > 0$, let Λ^η denote the family of functions h such that

$$\|h\|_{\Lambda^\eta} = \sup_{t\in(0,1]} t^{-\eta}\omega(h, t) < \infty.$$

Define a space $\Lambda_s^\eta = d_s \cap \Lambda^\eta$ and set $\|h\|_{\Lambda_s^\eta} = \|h\|_{d_s} + \|h\|_{\Lambda^\eta}$ for $h \in \Lambda_s^\eta$. Note that $\Lambda_s^{\eta_1} \subset \Lambda_s^{\eta_2}$ if $\eta_2 \le \eta_1$, and $\Lambda_{s_1}^\eta \subset \Lambda_{s_2}^\eta$ if $s_2 \le s_1$.

Let

$$Tf(x) = \text{p.v.} f * L(x) = \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y) L(y^{-1}x)\, dy, \tag{1.1}$$

where $L(x) = h(r(x))K(x)$, $h \in d_1$. We consider $L^q(\Sigma)$ spaces and write $\|F\|_q = \left(\int_\Sigma |F(\theta)|^q\, dS(\theta)\right)^{1/q}$ for $F \in L^q(\Sigma)$ ($\|F\|_\infty$ is defined as usual). Let $s' = s/(s-1)$ denote the conjugate exponent to s. We shall prove L^p estimates for Tf with $h \in \Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}$ and $\Omega \in L^s(\Sigma)$, $s > 1$, as s approaches 1.

Theorem 1. *Let $s > 1$. Suppose that $\Omega \in L^s(\Sigma)$ and $h \in \Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}$ for some fixed positive number η. Then, if $1 < p < \infty$,*

$$\|Tf\|_p \le C_p s(s-1)^{-1} \|h\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}} \|\Omega\|_s \|f\|_p,$$

where the constant C_p is independent of s, Ω and h.

We denote by $L\log L(\Sigma)$ the Zygmund class of all those functions F on Σ which satisfy

$$\int_\Sigma |F(\theta)| \log(2 + |F(\theta)|)\, dS(\theta) < \infty.$$

Let Λ denote the collection of functions h on $\mathbb{R}_+$ such that there exist a sequence $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of non-negative real numbers satisfying $h = \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k h_k$, $h_k \in \Lambda_{1+1/k}^{1/(k+1)}$, $\sup_{k\ge 1} \|h_k\|_{\Lambda_{1+1/k}^{1/(k+1)}} \le 1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^\infty k a_k < \infty$.

Theorem 1 implies the following result.

Theorem 2. *Let Tf be as in* (1.1). *Suppose that $h \in \Lambda$ and $\Omega \in L\log L(\Sigma)$. Then, T is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$.*

When $h = 1$ (a constant function), this is due to [28]. See [3, 4, 14, 16, 17, 18] for relevant results and also [23, 25, 28] for weak $(1,1)$ boundedness.

We also consider the maximal singular integral operator

$$T_* f(x) = \sup_{N,\epsilon>0} \left| \int_{\epsilon < r(y) < N} f(xy^{-1}) L(y)\, dy \right|. \tag{1.2}$$

We shall prove analogs of Theorems 1 and 2 for the operator T_*.

Theorem 3. *Let a number s and functions h, Ω be as in Theorem* 1. *Then we have*

$$\|T_* f\|_p \le C_p s(s-1)^{-1} \|h\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}} \|\Omega\|_s \|f\|_p$$

for all $p \in (1, \infty)$, where C_p is independent of s, h and Ω.

By Theorem 3 we have the following result.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that $\Omega \in L\log L(\Sigma)$ and $h \in \Lambda$. Let T_*f be defined as in (1.2) by using the functions Ω and h. Then, T_* is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$,*

This seems to be novel even in the case when $h = 1$. If $h = 1$, Theorem 2 can be proved by interpolation between L^2 estimates and weak $(1, 1)$ estimates, both of which are given in [28]. For T_* with $\Omega \in L\log L$, weak $(1, 1)$ boundedness is yet to be proved even in the case $h = 1$.

In this note we shall show that results of Tao [28] can be used to obtain an analog of a theory of Duoandikoetxea and Rubio de Francia [10] for homogeneous groups which can prove Theorems 1 and 3. In our situation, Littlewood-Paley theory (see Lemma 6 in Section 4) and interpolation arguments are available as in [10], although we cannot apply Fourier transform estimates as effectively as in [10]. We shall show that L^2 estimates of Lemma 1 in Section 3 can be used as a substitute for Fourier transform estimates if we apply Cotlar's lemma instead of Plancherel's theorem. Our methods may extend to the study of some other interesting operators in harmonic analysis (see [5], [10]).

Let $\{B_t\}_{t>0}$, $B_t = t^P = \exp((\log t)P)$, be a dilation group on $\mathbb{R}^n$, where P is an $n \times n$ real matrix whose eigenvalues have positive real parts. Let N be a locally integrable function on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $N(B_t x) = t^{-\gamma}N(x)$, $\gamma = \operatorname{trace} P$, for $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Let $J(x) = h(r(x))N(x)$ with an appropriate norm function $r(x)$ for $\{B_t\}_{t>0}$. If we define

$$Sf(x) = \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y)J(x - y)\,dy,$$

using Euclidean convolution, assuming an appropriate cancellation condition for J, then we can apply methods of Duoandikoetxea and Rubio de Francia [10] via Fourier transform estimates to prove L^p boundedness, $p \in (1, \infty)$, of S under an $L\log L$ condition on $\{r(x) = 1\}$ for N and the condition

$$\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \int_{2^j}^{2^{j+1}} |h(r)| \left(\log(2 + |h(r)|)\right)^a \, dr/r < \infty$$

for h with some $a > 2$. Also, a similar result for maximal singular integrals holds (see [21, 22]).

We can also prove some weighted norm estimates for T and T_*. Let B be a subset of $\mathbb{H}$ such that

$$B = \{x \in \mathbb{H} : r(a^{-1}x) < s\}$$

for some $a \in \mathbb{H}$ and $s > 0$. Then we call B a ball in $\mathbb{H}$ with center a and radius s and write $B = B(a, s)$. Note that $|B(a, s)| = cs^\gamma$ with $c = |B(0, 1)|$, where $|S|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of a set S. Let $\mathcal{A}_p$, $1 < p < \infty$, be the weight class of Muckenhoupt on $\mathbb{H}$ defined to be the collection of all weight functions w on $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying

$$\sup_B \left(|B|^{-1}\int_B w(x)\,dx\right)\left(|B|^{-1}\int_B w(x)^{-1/(p-1)}dx\right)^{p-1} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls B in $\mathbb{H}$ (see [1, 13]). Also, the class $\mathcal{A}_1$ is defined to be the family of all weight functions w on $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying the pointwise inequality $Mw \le Cw$ almost everywhere, where M denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator

$$Mf(x) = \sup_{x\in B} |B|^{-1}\int_B |f(y)|\,dy;$$

the supremum is taken over all balls B in $\mathbb{H}$ containing x (see [1, 8, 13]). We can prove the following weighted estimates.

Theorem 5. *Let* $q > 1$. *Suppose that* $\Omega \in L^q(\Sigma)$ *and* $h \in \Lambda_q^\eta$ *for some* $\eta > 0$. *Let* $1 < p < \infty$. *Then,*

1. T *and* T_* *are bounded on* $L^p(w)$ *if* $q' \le p < \infty$ *and* $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p/q'}$;
2. *if* $1 < p \le q$ *and* $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p'/q'}$, T *and* T_* *are bounded on* $L^p(w^{1-p})$.

See [9, 29] for the case of rough singular integrals defined by Euclidean convolution.

In Section 2, we shall give some preliminary results from [28] for calculation on homogeneous groups. A basic L^2 estimates (Lemma 1) will be proved in Section 3 by applying methods of [28]. Using the L^2 estimate, we shall prove Theorem 1 in Section 4 by means of a process of [10, 21, 22]. In Section 5, we shall prove Theorem 3 by adapting arguments of [10] for the present situation. Theorem 5 will be proved in Section 6 by applying arguments of [9] and using results of Sections 3–5. Finally, we shall prove Theorem 2 from Theorem 1 in Section 7 by an extrapolation argument. Theorem 4 can be proved in the same way from Theorem 3. In what follows, even when we consider functions that may assume general complex values, we deal with real valued functions only to simplify our arguments. The letters C, c will be used to denote positive constants which may be different in different occurrences.

2. Preliminary results

In this section we recall several results from [28]. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{H}$ be smooth. Then the Euclidean derivative $\partial_t f(t)$ is defined by

$$f(t+\epsilon) = f(t) + \epsilon\partial_t f(t) + \epsilon^2 O(1) \quad \text{for } \epsilon \in (0,1].$$

We define the left invariant derivative $\partial_t^L f(t)$ by

$$f(t+\epsilon) = f(t)(\epsilon\partial_t^L f(t)) + \epsilon^2 O(1) \quad \text{for } \epsilon \in (0,1].$$

Fix $x \in \mathbb{H}$ and consider $G_x : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by $G_x(y) = xy$. Let $JG_x(y)$ be the Jacobian matrix of G_x at y. Then $JG_x(y)$ is a lower triangular matrix. The components of $JG_x(y)$ are polynomials in x, y and each diagonal component is equal to 1 (see (3) in Section 1). We can see that $\partial_t^L f(t) = JG_{f(t)^{-1}}(f(t))\partial_t f(t)$.

We have the product rule

$$\partial_t^L (f(t)g(t)) = \partial_t^L g(t) + C[g(t)]\partial_t^L f(t), \tag{2.1}$$

where $C[x] : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a linear mapping defined by

$$x^{-1}(\epsilon v)x = \epsilon C[x]v + \epsilon^2 O(1) \quad \text{for } \epsilon \in (0,1].$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} C[x^{-1}] =& C[x]^{-1}, \quad C[A_t x](A_t v) = A_t(C[x]v), \\ &|C[x]v| \sim |v| \quad \text{if } |x| \le 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Define a polynomial mapping $X : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$A_{1+\epsilon}x = x(\epsilon X(x)) + \epsilon^2 O(1) \quad \text{for } \epsilon \in (0,1].$$

Then

$$X(A_t x) = A_t X(x), \quad r(X(x)) \sim r(x) \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\partial_t^L (A_{s(t)} f(t)) = A_{s(t)}\partial_t^L f(t) + s'(t)s(t)^{-1}\left(A_{s(t)}X(f(t))\right), \tag{2.4}$$

where $s(t)$ is a strictly positive, smooth function on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Also, X is a diffeomorphism with Jacobian comparable to 1.

3. L^2 ESTIMATES

Let ϕ be a C^∞ function with compact support in $B(0,1) \setminus B(0,1/2)$ satisfying $\int \phi = 1$, $\phi(x) = \tilde{\phi}(x)$, $\phi(x) \ge 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\tilde{\phi}(x) = \phi(x^{-1})$. Define

$$\Delta_k = \delta_{\rho^{k-1}}\phi - \delta_{\rho^k}\phi, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $\delta_t\phi(x) = t^{-\gamma}\phi(A_t^{-1}x)$ and $\rho \ge 2$. Note that $\operatorname{supp}(\Delta_k) \subset B(0,\rho^k) \setminus B(0,\rho^{k-1}/2)$, $\Delta_k = \tilde{\Delta}_k$ and $\sum_k \Delta_k = \delta$, where δ is the delta function. Let $\psi_j \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, be such that

$$\operatorname{supp}(\psi_j) \subset \{t \in \mathbb{R} : \rho^j \le t \le \rho^{j+2}\}, \quad \psi_j \ge 0,$$

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \psi_j(t) = 1 \quad \text{for } t \ne 0,$$

$$|(d/dt)^m \psi_j(t)| \le c_m |t|^{-m} \quad \text{for } m = 0,1,2,\dots,$$

where c_m is a constant independent of ρ (this is possible since $\rho \ge 2$).

Let

$$S_j L(x) = (\log 2)^{-1} h(r(x)) \int_0^\infty \psi_j(t)\delta_t K_0(x)\, dt/t,$$

where

$$K_0(x) = K(x)\chi_{D_0}(x), \quad D_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1 \le r(x) \le 2\}.$$

Here χ_E denotes the characteristic function of a set E. Then $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} S_j L = L$. Furthermore, let

$$S_j(F,\ell)(x) = (\log 2)^{-1}\ell(r(x))\int_0^\infty \psi_j(t)\delta_t F(x)\,dt/t, \tag{3.1}$$

where $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\operatorname{supp}(F) \subset D_0$ and $\ell \in d_1$. Let Φ be a non-negative smooth function such that $\int \Phi(x)\,dx = 1$, $\Phi(x^{-1}) = \Phi(x)$, $\operatorname{supp}(\Phi) \subset B(0,1)$. Define

$$U_\sigma f = U_\sigma(F,\ell)(f) = \sum_j \sigma_j f * \nu_j, \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$\nu_j(x) = \nu_j(F,\ell)(x) = S_j(F,\ell)(x) - \Phi_j(x),$$
$$\Phi_j(x) = \Phi_j(F,\ell)(x) = \Big(\int S_j(F,\ell)\,dx\Big)\delta_{\rho^j}\Phi(x),$$

and $\sigma = \{\sigma_j\}$ is an arbitrary sequence such that $\sigma_j = 1$ or -1. We note that $\int \nu_j(x)\,dx = 0$, $S_j L = \nu_j(K_0,h) = S_j(K_0,h)$ and $U_\sigma(K_0,h)(f) = Tf$ if $\sigma_j = 1$ for all j. We prove the following L^2 estimates.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $s > 1$, $F \in L^s(D_0)$ and $\ell \in \Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}$ for some fixed positive number η, where we write $F \in L^s(D_0)$ if $F \in L^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(F) \subset D_0$. Let $\nu_j = \nu_j(F,\ell)$. Then, for $j,k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\|f * \nu_j * \Delta_k\|_2 \le C(\log\rho)\min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|j-k|-c)/s'})\|\ell\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s\|f\|_2 \tag{3.3}$$

for some positive constants C, ϵ and c independent of ρ, s, ℓ and F.

Proof. It suffices to prove Lemma 1 with ν in place of ν_j, assuming $j = 0$ on the right hand side of (3.3), where

$$\nu(x) = (\log 2)^{-1}\ell(\rho^j r(x))\int_0^\infty \psi_j(\rho^j t)\delta_t F(x)\,dt/t - \Big(\int S_j(F,\ell)\,dx\Big)\Phi(x).$$

This can be seen from change of variables and the formulas: $\delta_t(f*g) = (\delta_t f)*(\delta_t g)$, $\delta_{\rho^{-j}}\nu_j = \nu$, $\delta_{\rho^{-j}}\Delta_k = \Delta_{k-j}$.

If $k \ge 0$, then from the cancellation condition for ν and the smoothness of Δ_k we have

$$\|\nu * \Delta_k\|_1 \le C(\log\rho)\min\left(1, \rho^{-\epsilon k+\tau}\right)\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1 \tag{3.4}$$

for some $\epsilon, \tau > 0$, which implies the conclusion by Young's inequality, if the constant c is large enough.

The following result is useful.

Lemma 2. *Suppose that $\ell \in d_q$, $F \in L^q(D_0)$ for some $q \ge 1$. Put $S = \delta_{\rho^{-j}}S_j(F,\ell)$. Then*

$$\|S\|_q \le C(\log\rho)\|\ell\|_{d_q}\|F\|_q,$$

where the constant C is independent of ρ and q.

Proof. Suppose that $q < \infty$. Since $\int_0^\infty \psi_j(\rho^j t)\,dt/t \le 2\log\rho$, Hölder's inequality implies

$$\|S\|_q^q \le (\log 2)^{-q}(2\log\rho)^{q/q'} \iint_0^\infty |\ell(\rho^j r(x))|^q \psi_j(\rho^j t)|\delta_t F(x)|^q\,dt/t\,dx$$
$$= (\log 2)^{-q}(2\log\rho)^{q/q'} \iint_0^\infty |\ell(\rho^j tr(x))|^q \psi_j(\rho^j t)|F(x)|^q t^{\gamma(1-q)}\,dt/t\,dx.$$

Let N be a positive integer such that $\rho^2 \le 2^{N+1} < 2\rho^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty |\ell(\rho^j tr(x))|^q \psi_j(\rho^j t) t^{\gamma(1-q)}\,dt/t \\
&\le \sum_{m=0}^{N} \int_{2^m\rho^j r(x)}^{2^{m+1}\rho^j r(x)} |\ell(t)|^q (\rho^{-j}r(x)^{-1}t)^{\gamma(1-q)}\,dt/t. \\
&\le \sum_{m=0}^{N} 2^{m\gamma(1-q)} \int_{2^m\rho^j r(x)}^{2^{m+1}\rho^j r(x)} |\ell(t)|^q\,dt/t \\
&\le C(\log\rho)\|\ell\|_{d_q}^q,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C \le 12$. Collecting results, we get the conclusion for $q < \infty$. Also, we easily see that $\|S\|_\infty \le C\|\ell\|_{d_\infty}\|F\|_\infty$, which implies the conclusion for $q = \infty$. $\square$

The estimate (3.4) can be shown as follows. First, by Lemma 2 with $q = 1$

$$\|\nu * \Delta_k\|_1 \le C(\log\rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1. \tag{3.5}$$

Suppose that $k \ge 1$. Let $t = \rho^{k-1}$. Then $\Delta_k = \delta_t\Delta_1$. Since $\int \nu = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu * \Delta_k(x) &= \int t^{-\gamma}\left(\Delta_1(A_t^{-1}(y^{-1}x)) - \Delta_1(A_t^{-1}x)\right)\nu(y)\,dy \\
&= \int t^{-\gamma}\left(\int_0^1 W'(u)\,du\right)\nu(y)\,dy,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$W(u) = \Delta_1((uY)^{-1}X) = \Delta_1(P_1(-uY, X), \dots, P_n(-uY, X)),$$

with $Y = A_{t^{-1}}y, X = A_{t^{-1}}x$ (see (3) in Section 1). Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
W'(u) = \langle(\nabla\Delta_1)&(P_1(-uY,X),\dots,P_n(-uY,X)), \\
&(\partial u P_1(-uY,X),\dots,\partial u P_n(-uY,X))\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla\Delta_1 = (\partial x_1\Delta_1, \partial x_2\Delta_1, \dots, \partial x_n\Delta_1)$ and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the Euclidean inner product in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Also, note that

$$\partial u P_i(-uY, X) = \langle -Y, \nabla_x P_i(-uY, X)\rangle,$$

where

$$\nabla_x P_i(x, y) = (\partial x_1 P_i(x,y), \dots, \partial x_n P_i(x,y)).$$

We may assume that $r(Y) \leq C\rho^2$, $r(X) \leq C\rho^2$ in (3.6) by checking the support condition. Therefore

$$\sup_{u\in[0,1]} |\partial u P_i(-uY, X)| \leq C|Y|\rho^M$$

for some $M > 0$ and hence

$$|W'(u)| \leq C|Y|\rho^M |(\nabla\Delta_1)((uY)^{-1}X)|.$$

Note that $\|\nabla\Delta_1\|_1 \leq C$, $\|A_t^{-1}\|$ (a norm for A_t^{-1} as a linear transformation on $\mathbb{R}^n$) is less than $Ct^{-\beta}$ and $|y| \leq C\rho^{2\alpha}$ on the support of ν, with $\beta = 1/\beta_1, \alpha = 1/\alpha_1$ (see (6) of Section 1). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu * \Delta_k\|_1 &\leq C\rho^M \|\nabla\Delta_1\|_1 \int |A_t^{-1}(y)||\nu(y)|\,dy \\ &\leq C\rho^M t^{-\beta} \int |y||\nu(y)|\,dy \\ &\leq C\rho^M t^{-\beta}\rho^{2\alpha}\|\nu\|_1 \leq C(\log\rho)\rho^{-k\beta}\rho^{2\alpha+\beta+M}\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

By (3.5) and (3.7), we have (3.4) for $k \geq 0$.

We next assume that $k \leq -1$. Since $\int \Delta_0(x)\,dx = 0$, as in the proof of (3.4) we have

$$\|\Phi * \Delta_k\|_1 = \|\delta_{\rho^{-k}}\Phi * \Delta_0\|_1 \leq C\rho^{-\epsilon|k|}.$$

Therefore, separately estimating $\|f * S * \Delta_k\|_2$ and $\|f * (\int S_j(F,\ell))\Phi * \Delta_k\|_2$, it suffices to prove

$$\|f * S * \Delta_k\|_2 \leq C(\log\rho)\min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|k|-c)/s'})\|\ell\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s\|f\|_2, \tag{3.8}$$

where $S = \delta_{\rho^{-j}}S_j(F,\ell)$ as above.

By the estimate

$$\|S * \Delta_k\|_1 \leq C(\log\rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1$$

and the T^*T method, to prove (3.8) it suffices to show that

$$\left\|f * \Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S * \Delta_k\right\|_2 \leq C(\log\rho)^2\rho^{\epsilon(k+c)/s'}\|\ell\|^2_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s^2\|f\|_2. \tag{3.9}$$

Since $\|T^*T\| = \|(T^*T)^n\|^{1/n}$, (3.9) follows from

$$\left\|f * \Big(\Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S * \Delta_k\Big)_*^n\right\|_2 \leq C(\log\rho)^{2n}\rho^{\epsilon(k+c)/s'}\|\ell\|^{2n}_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s^{2n}\|f\|_2$$

for some $\epsilon, c > 0$, where $\Big(\Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S * \Delta_k\Big)_*^n$ denotes the convolution product of n factors of $\Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S * \Delta_k$. By Young's inequality, this follows from the L^1 estimate

$$\left\|\Big(\Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S * \Delta_k\Big)_*^n\right\|_1 \leq C(\log\rho)^{2n}\rho^{\epsilon(k+c)/s'}\|\ell\|^{2n}_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s^{2n}. \tag{3.10}$$

Note that $\left(\Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S * \Delta_k\right)_*^n = \Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S * \left(\Delta_k * \Delta_k * \tilde{S} * S\right)_*^{n-1} * \Delta_k$. Since $\|\Delta_k' * \tilde{S}\|_1 \leq C(\log\rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1$ and $\Delta_k' * \tilde{S}(x) = \int \delta_y(x)\Delta_k' * \tilde{S}(y)\,dy$, where $\delta_y(x)$ is the delta function concentrated at y and Δ_k' is either Δ_k or $\Delta_k * \Delta_k$, (3.10) follows from

$$\|\delta_{w_1} * S * \cdots * \delta_{w_n} * S * \Delta_k\|_1 \leq C(\log\rho)^n \rho^{\epsilon(k+c)/s'}\|\ell\|^n_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s^n$$

uniformly for $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in B(0, C\rho^2)$. To get this, it suffices to prove

$$|\langle \delta_{w_1} * S * \cdots * \delta_{w_n} * S * \Delta_k, g\rangle| \leq C(\log\rho)^n \rho^{\epsilon(k+c)/s'}\|\ell\|^n_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s^n \tag{3.11}$$

uniformly in $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in B(0, C\rho^2)$, for all smooth g with compact support satisfying $\|g\|_\infty \leq 1$.

Fix g. Then, the inner product on the left hand side of (3.11) is equal to

$$\iiint \Delta_k(x) g(H(y,t)x) \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\ell(t_i, y_i)F(y_i)\psi(t_i)\right)\,dy\,\bar{d}t\,dx, \tag{3.12}$$

where $\ell(t_i, y_i) = \ell(t_i\rho^j r(y_i))$, $\psi(t_i) = (\log 2)^{-1}\psi_j(\rho^j t_i)$, $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in D_0^n$, $\bar{d}t = (dt_1/t_1)\ldots(dt_n/t_n)$, $dy = dy_1 \ldots dy_n$ and

$$H(y,t) = \prod_{i=1}^n w_i A_{t_i} y_i = w_1 A_{t_1} y_1 \ldots w_n A_{t_n} y_n.$$

This is valid since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \delta_{w_1} * S * \cdots * \delta_{w_n} * S * \Delta_k, g\rangle \\
&= \int S(y_1)\ldots S(y_n)\Delta_k(x) g\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n w_i y_i\right)x\right)\,dy\,dx \\
&= \int \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\psi(t_i)\ell(\rho^j r(y_i))\delta_{t_i}F(y_i)\right]\Delta_k(x) g\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n w_i y_i\right)x\right)\,dy\,dx\,\bar{d}t,
\end{aligned}$$

which will coincide with the integral in (3.12) after a change of variables.

Let $DH(y,t)$ be the $n \times n$ matrix whose ith column vector is $\partial_{t_i}^L H(y,t)$:

$$DH(y,t) = \left(\partial_{t_1}^L H(y,t), \ldots, \partial_{t_n}^L H(y,t)\right).$$

Then, (3.11) follows from the two estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\iiint \Delta_k(x) G_1(y,t) g(H(y,t)x) \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\psi(t_i)\ell(t_i, y_i)F(y_i)\right)\,dy\,\bar{d}t\,dx\right| \\
&\qquad\qquad \leq C(\log\rho)^n \rho^{\epsilon(k+c)/s'}\|\ell\|^n_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_s^n,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\left|\iiint \Delta_k(x)G_2(y,t)g(H(y,t)x)\prod_{i=1}^{n}\left(\psi(t_i)\ell(t_i,y_i)F(y_i)\right)\,dy\,\bar{d}t\,dx\right| \\ \leq C(\log\rho)^n\rho^{\delta\epsilon(k+c)/s'}\|\ell\|^n_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|F\|_1^n \tag{3.14}$$

with

$$G_1(y,t) = \zeta_1\left(\rho^{-n\epsilon k}\det(DH(y,t))\right),$$
$$G_2(y,t) = \zeta_2\left(\rho^{-n\epsilon k}\det(DH(y,t))\right),$$

where ζ_1 is a function in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \leq \zeta_1 \leq 1$, $\operatorname{supp}(\zeta_1) \subset [-1,1]$, $\zeta_1(t) = 1$ for $t \in [-1/2, 1/2]$, $\zeta_2 = 1 - \zeta_1$, and δ, ϵ are small positive numbers.

Proof of (3.13). Since $\|\Delta_k\|_1 \leq C$, $\int \psi(t_i)\,dt_i/t_i \leq C\log\rho$ and

$$\int |F(y_i)\ell(t_i,y_i)|^s\psi(t_i)\,dy_i\,dt_i/t_i \leq C(\log\rho)\|\ell\|^s_{d_s}\|F\|^s_s$$

(see the proof of Lemma 2), by Hölder's inequality, it suffices to show that

$$\int_{D_0^n}\chi_{[0,1]}\left(\rho^{-kn\epsilon}\left|\det(DH(y,t))\right|\right)\,dy \leq C\rho^{\epsilon(k+c)} \tag{3.15}$$

uniformly in $t \in [1,\rho^2]^n$ and $w_1,\dots w_n \in B(0,C\rho^2)$. By (2.1) and (2.4)

$$\partial^L_{t_i}H(y,t) = t_i^{-1}C[Q_i](A_{t_i}X(y_i)), 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \quad \partial^L_{t_n}H(y,t) = t_n^{-1}A_{t_n}X(y_n)$$

where $Q_i = \prod_{j=i+1}^n w_jA_{t_j}y_j$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Fixing $y_2,\dots,y_n$ and changing variables with respect to y_1, we see that the integral in (3.15) is majorized by

$$Ct_1^{-\gamma}\int_{\tilde{D}_0\times D_0^{n-1}}\chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}t_1^{-1}\left|\det(J(y,t))\right|\right)\,dy_1d\bar{y},$$

where $\tilde{D}_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq C\rho^M\}$, $M, C > 0$, $d\bar{y} = dy_2\dots dy_n$ and

$$J(y,t) = (y_1, \partial^L_{t_2}H(y,t),\dots,\partial^L_{t_n}H(y,t)).$$

To see this, it may be convenient to write

$$\partial^L_{t_1}H(y,t) = t_1^{-1}A_{\rho^2}C[A_{\rho^{-2}}Q_1](A_{\rho^{-2}}A_{t_1}X(y_1)),$$

and to note that $|A_{\rho^{-2}}Q_1| \leq C$ (see (2.2)). Repeating this argument successively for $y_2,\dots,y_n$, we can see that (3.15) follows from

$$(t_1\dots t_n)^{-\gamma}\int_{\tilde{D}_0^n}\chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|\det Y\right|\right)\,dy \leq C\rho^{\epsilon(k+c)}, \tag{3.16}$$

where Y denotes the $n \times n$ matrix whose ith column vector is y_i. Write $y_i = (y_i^1,\dots,y_i^n)$.

To prove (3.16), expand $\det Y = \sum_{m=1}^n y_1^m\Delta_{m1}$, where Δ_{m1} denotes the $(m,1)$ cofactor of Y. Then, using this and applying a rotation in y_1 variable, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\tilde{D}_0^n} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|\det Y\right|\right)\,dy\\ &=\int_{\tilde{D}_0^n} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|y_1^1\left(\sum_{m=1}^n \Delta_{m1}^2\right)^{1/2}\right|\right)\,dy\\ &\le \int_{\tilde{D}_0^n} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|y_1^1\Delta_{11}\right|\right)\,dy.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{D}_{01}=\{y_1\in\tilde{D}_0 : |y_1^1|<t_1\rho^{k\epsilon}\}$, $\tilde{D}_{02}=\{y_1\in\tilde{D}_0 : |y_1^1|\ge t_1\rho^{k\epsilon}\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\tilde{D}_0} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|y_1^1\Delta_{11}\right|\right)\,dy_1\\ &=\sum_{i=1}^2\int_{\tilde{D}_{0i}} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|y_1^1\Delta_{11}\right|\right)\,dy_1\\ &\le Ct_1\rho^{k\epsilon}\rho^{M(n-1)}+C\rho^{Mn}\chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-k(n-1)\epsilon}(t_2\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|\Delta_{11}\right|\right),\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\tilde{D}_0^n} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|\det Y\right|\right)\,dy\\ &\qquad\le C\rho^{k\epsilon}\rho^b+C\rho^{Mn}\int_{\tilde{D}_0^{n-1}} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-k(n-1)\epsilon}(t_2\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|\Delta_{11}\right|\right)\,d\bar{y}\end{aligned}$$

for some $b>0$. Repeating a procedure similar to this $n-1$ times, we reach the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\tilde{D}_0^n} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-kn\epsilon}(t_1\dots t_n)^{-1}\left|\det Y\right|\right)\,dy\\ &\le C\rho^{k\epsilon}\rho^b+C\rho^b\int_{\tilde{D}_0} \chi_{[0,1]}\left(c\rho^{-k\epsilon}t_n^{-1}\left|y_n^n\right|\right)\,dy_n\le C\rho^{k\epsilon}\rho^\tau\end{aligned}$$

for some $\tau>0$. This proves (3.16).

Proof of (3.14). Let

$$\tilde{\ell}(t_i,y_i)=\int_{s_i<t_i/2}\ell(t_i-s_i,y_i)\varphi_{\rho^{\epsilon k}}(s_i)\,ds_i,$$

where $\varphi_u(s_i) = u^{-1}\varphi(u^{-1}s_i)$, $u > 0$, with $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi) \subset (0, 1/8)$, $\varphi \geq 0$, $\int \varphi(s)\, ds = 1$. Then

$$\int \psi(t_i)|\ell(t_i, y_i)|\, dt_i/t_i \leq C(\log \rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1},$$

$$\int \psi(t_i)|\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)|\, dt_i/t_i \leq C(\log \rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1},$$

$$\int \psi(t_i)|\ell(t_i, y_i) - \tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)|\, dt_i/t_i \leq C(\log \rho)\omega(\ell, \rho^{\epsilon k}).$$

Therefore, writing

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ell(t_1, y_1)\dots\ell(t_n, y_n) - \tilde{\ell}(t_1, y_1)\dots\tilde{\ell}(t_n, y_n) \\
&= (\ell(t_1, y_1) - \tilde{\ell}(t_1, y_1))\ell(t_2, y_2)\dots\ell(t_n, y_n) \\
&+ \tilde{\ell}(t_1, y_1)(\ell(t_2, y_2) - \tilde{\ell}(t_2, y_2))\ell(t_3, y_3)\dots\ell(t_n, y_n) \\
&+ \dots + \tilde{\ell}(t_1, y_1)\dots\tilde{\ell}(t_{n-1}, y_{n-1})(\ell(t_n, y_n) - \tilde{\ell}(t_n, y_n)),
\end{aligned}$$

and applying the inequality $\omega(\ell, t) \leq \|\ell\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}} t^{\eta/s'}$, we see that to get (3.14) it suffices to prove a variant of (3.14) where each $\ell(t_i, y_i)$ is replaced by $\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. To show the estimate, it suffices to prove

$$\left| \iint \Delta_k(x) G_2(y, t) g(H(y, t)x) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Big(\psi(t_i)\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i) \Big)\, \bar{d}t\, dx \right| \leq C\rho^{\delta\epsilon k}\rho^{\tau}\|\ell\|_{d_1}^n \tag{3.17}$$

uniformly in $y \in D_0^n$ and $w_1, \dots, w_n \in B(0, C\rho^2)$ with some $\tau > 0$, since the quantity on the left hand side of (3.17) is also bounded by $C(\log \rho)^n\|\ell\|_{d_1}^n$.

To prove (3.17) we need the following three lemmas.

Lemma 3. *Let f be a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset B(0, C_1), \quad \int f(x)\, dx = 0, \quad \|f\|_1 \leq C_2.$$

Then there exist functions $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \partial_{x_i} f_i(x),$$
$$\operatorname{supp}(f_i) \subset B(0, C_1'), \quad \|f_i\|_1 \leq C_2' \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

with some constants C_1' and C_2'.

This is from Lemma 7.1 in [28].

Lemma 4. *Let Δ_k be as in* (3.14). *Then, there exist functions F_j, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, such that* $\mathrm{supp}(F_j) \subset B(0, C\rho^k)$, $\|F_j\|_1 \le C\rho^{k\alpha}$ *for some $\alpha > 0$ and*

$$\Delta_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \partial_{x_j} F_j(x).$$

This follows from Lemma 3.

Lemma 5. *Suppose that* $\det(DH(y,t)x) \neq 0$, *where $DH(y,t)x$ is defined in the same way as $DH(y,t)$ with $H(y,t)x$ in place of $H(y,t)$. Then*

$$\partial_{x_i} g(H(y,t)x) = \left\langle \nabla_t g(H(y,t)x), (DH(y,t)x)^{-1}(\partial^L_{x_i}(H(y,t)x)) \right\rangle.$$

(*see Lemma* 7.2 *of* [28]).

By Lemma 4, (3.17) follows from the estimate

$$\left| \iint \partial_{x_m} F_m(x) g(H(y,t)x) a(t) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)\, \bar{d}t\, dx \right| \le C\rho^{k\delta\epsilon}\rho^{\tau}\|\ell\|^n_{d_1} \tag{3.18}$$

for each m, $1 \le m \le n$, where $a(t) = G_2(y,t)\prod_{i=1}^{n}\psi(t_i)$. Applying integration by parts and using the L^1 norm estimate for F_m in Lemma 4, to prove (3.18) it suffices to show that

$$\left| \int \partial_{x_m} g(H(y,t)x) a(t) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)\, \bar{d}t \right| \le C\rho^{-2nk\epsilon}\rho^{\tau}\|\ell\|^n_{d_1} \tag{3.19}$$

for all $x \in B(0, C\rho^k)$ with a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. By Lemma 5, the estimate (3.19) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int \left\langle \nabla_t g(H(y,t)x), (DH(y,t)x)^{-1}(\partial^L_{x_m} x) \right\rangle a(t) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)\, \bar{d}t \right| \\ &\qquad \le C\rho^{-2nk\epsilon}\rho^{\tau}\|\ell\|^n_{d_1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

since $\partial^L_{x_m}(H(y,t)x) = \partial^L_{x_m} x$ (see Section 2). Note that $|\nabla_t a(t)| \le C\rho^{-kn\epsilon}\rho^{\tau}$ and $|\det(DH(y,t)x)| \ge C\rho^{kn\epsilon}$ on the support of a, since

$$|\det(DH(y,t)x)| = |\det \bar{C}[x] \det DH(y,t)| \ge C|\det DH(y,t)|,$$

where $\bar{C}[x]$ denotes the matrix expression for the linear transformation $C[x]$ (see (2.1), (2.2)). Thus, taking into account Cramer's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \partial_{t_u} \left[a(t) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)(DH(y,t)x)^{-1}(\partial^L_{x_m} x) \right] \right| \\ &\qquad \le C\rho^{-2nk\epsilon}\rho^{\tau} \prod_{i=1}^{n} |\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)| + C\rho^{-nk\epsilon}\rho^{\tau} |\partial_{t_u}\tilde{\ell}(t_u, y_u)| \prod_{i \neq u} |\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)| \end{aligned}$$

for some $\tau > 0$. Also, note that

$$\int_1^{\rho^2} |\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)| \, dt_i/t_i \le C(\log \rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1}$$

and

$$\int_1^{\rho^2} |\partial_{t_i}\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)| \, dt_i/t_i \le C(\log \rho)\rho^{-k\epsilon}\|\ell\|_{d_1},$$

which follows from

$$|\partial_{t_i}\tilde{\ell}(t_i, y_i)| \le C\rho^{-k\epsilon}\int |\ell(t_i - s_i, y_i)||\varphi'_{\rho^{\epsilon k}}(s_i)| \, ds_i.$$

These estimates along with integration by parts imply (3.20). This completes the proof of (3.14) and hence that of Lemma 1. □

4. Proof of Theorem 1

We use the following weighted Littlewood-Paley inequalities.

Lemma 6. *Let $w \in \mathcal{A}_p$, $1 < p < \infty$, and let the functions Δ_k be as in Section 3. Then*

$$\left\| \sum_k f_k * \Delta_k \right\|_{L^p(w)} \le C_{p,w} \left\| \left(\sum_k |f_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^p(w)}, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\left\| \left(\sum_k |f * \Delta_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^p(w)} \le C_{p,w}\|f\|_{L^p(w)}, \tag{4.2}$$

where the constant $C_{p,w}$ is independent of $\rho \ge 2$.

Proof. Let $K(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{J}} \sigma_k\Delta_k(x)$, where $\mathcal{J}$ is an arbitrary finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\{\sigma_k\}$ is an arbitrary sequence such that $\sigma_k = 1$ or -1. Let $Sf(x) = f * K(x)$. Then

1. S is bounded on L^2 with the operator norm bounded by a constant independent of ρ, $\mathcal{J}$ and $\{\sigma_k\}$;
2. $|K(x)| \le Cr(x)^{-\gamma}$;
3. there are positive constants C_1 and ϵ such that $r(x) > C_1 r(y)$ implies
$$|K(y^{-1}x) - K(x)| \le Cr(y)^{\epsilon}r(x)^{-\gamma-\epsilon}.$$

The proof of (3.4) applies to show

$$\|\Delta_k * \Delta_j\|_1 \le C\min\left(1, \rho^{-\epsilon|j-k|+c}\right).$$

By this and the Cotlar-Knapp-Stein lemma we get (1). The estimates in (2) and (3) can be shown by a straightforward computation. We note that, to prove the estimate in (3), it suffices to show that if $r(x) > C_1 r(y)$, then

$$|\delta_k\phi(y^{-1}x) - \delta_k\phi(x)| \le Cr(y)^{\epsilon}r(x)^{-\gamma-\epsilon}$$

for each k. By application of dilation, this follows from the case $k = 0$, which can be easily proved.

Using (1), (2), (3) and applying methods of [7, Chapitre IV] and the proof of Theorem III in [6], we have $\|Sf\|_{L^p(w)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^p(w)}$ for $w \in \mathcal{A}_p$, $1 < p < \infty$, with a constant C independent of $\mathcal{I}$, $\{\sigma_k\}$ and ρ. From this and the Khintchine inequality, (4.2) follows. A duality argument and (4.2) imply (4.1). □

Let

$$M_{F,\ell}f(x) = \sup_j |f * S_j(|F|, |\ell|)(x)|,$$

where $S_j(F, \ell)$ is as in Section 3 (see (3.1)). Put $\mu^* f = M_{F,\ell}f$. Let $\theta \in (0, 1)$. We prove the following result along with Theorem 1.

Lemma 7. *Let $s > 1$, $F \in L^s(D_0)$ and $\ell \in \Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}$ for some fixed $\eta > 0$. Then, there exist positive constants ϵ, C independent of ρ and s such that*

$$\|\mu^* f\|_p \leq C(\log \rho)(1 - \rho^{-\theta\epsilon/(2s')})^{-4/p} \|\ell\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}} \|F\|_s \|f\|_p$$

for $p > 1 + \theta$.

In Lemmas 1 and 7, we can have the same value of ϵ.

Proof of Lemma 7. Let $U_\sigma = U_\sigma(F, \ell)$ (see (3.2)) and write $U_\sigma f = \sum_{k_1,k_2} U_{k_1,k_2} f$, where

$$U_{k_1,k_2} f = \sum_j \sigma_j f * \Delta_{k_1+j} * \nu_j * \Delta_{k_2+j}, \quad \nu_j = \nu_j(F, \ell).$$

Fix integers k_1, k_2. By Lemma 1 and duality we have

$$\|f * \Delta_k * \nu_j\|_2 \leq C(\log \rho) \min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|k-j|-c)/s'}) \|\ell\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}} \|F\|_s \|f\|_2.$$

Using this along with Lemma 1, for ν_j and $\tilde{\nu_j}$, and noting that $\|\Delta_{k_2+j} * \Delta_{k_2+j'}\|_1 \leq C \min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|j-j'|-c)})$, where we may assume that the number ϵ is equal to the value of ϵ in Lemmas 1 and 7, $\|\Delta_k\|_1 \leq C$, $\|\nu_j\|_1 \leq C(\log \rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (4.3) \quad & \|f * (\Delta_{k_1+j} * \nu_j) * (\Delta_{k_2+j} * \Delta_{k_2+j'}) * (\tilde{\nu}_{j'} * \Delta_{k_1+j'})\|_2 \\ & \qquad \leq CA^2 \min(1, \rho^{-2\epsilon(|k_1|-c)/s'}) \min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|j-j'|-c)}) \|f\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $A = (\log \rho)\|\ell\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}} \|F\|_s$, and also

$$\begin{aligned} (4.4) \quad & \|f * \Delta_{k_1+j} * (\nu_j * \Delta_{k_2+j}) * (\Delta_{k_2+j'} * \tilde{\nu}_{j'}) * \Delta_{k_1+j'}\|_2 \\ & \qquad \leq CA^2 \min(1, \rho^{-2\epsilon(|k_2|-c)/s'}) \|f\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.3) and (4.4), taking the geometric mean we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|f * \Delta_{k_1+j} * \nu_j * \Delta_{k_2+j} * \Delta_{k_2+j'} * \tilde{\nu}_{j'} * \Delta_{k_1+j'}\|_2 \\ &\qquad \le CA^2 \prod_{i=1}^{2} \min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|k_i|-c)/s'}) \min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|j-j'|-c)/2})\|f\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

We can obtain a similar estimate for

$$\|f * \Delta_{k_2+j'} * \tilde{\nu}_{j'} * \Delta_{k_1+j'} * \Delta_{k_1+j} * \nu_j * \Delta_{k_2+j}\|_2.$$

Therefore, by the Cotlar-Knapp-Stein lemma we see that

$$\|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_2 \le CA \prod_{i=1}^{2} \min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|k_i|-c)/(2s')})\|f\|_2 \tag{4.5}$$

uniformly in σ. By (4.5) we have

$$\|U_\sigma f\|_2 \le \sum_{k_1,k_2} \|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_2 \le CA(1-\rho^{-\epsilon/(2s')})^{-2}\|f\|_2 \le CAB\|f\|_2, \tag{4.6}$$

where $B = (1-\rho^{-\theta\epsilon/(2s')})^{-2}$.

We define a sequence $\{p_j\}_1^\infty$ by $p_1 = 2$ and $1/p_{j+1} = 1/2 + (1-\theta)/(2p_j)$ for $j \ge 1$. Then, $1/p_j = (1-a^j)/(1+\theta)$, where $a = (1-\theta)/2$, so $\{p_j\}$ is decreasingly converges to $1+\theta$. For $m \ge 1$ we show that

$$\|U_\sigma f\|_{p_m} \le C_m A B^{2/p_m} \|f\|_{p_m} \tag{4.7}$$

uniformly in σ, for all F and ℓ satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 7. For $m = 1$, this is a consequence of (4.6). Fix $m \ge 1$ and assume (4.7) for this m. Then, using it for $U_\sigma(|F|, |\ell|)$ and applying the Khintchine inequality, we see that

$$\|g(f)\|_{p_m} \le CAB^{2/p_m}\|f\|_{p_m}, \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$g(f) = \left(\sum_j |f * \nu_j(|F|, |\ell|)|^2\right)^{1/2}$$

(note that $\omega(|\ell|, t) \le C\omega(\ell, t)$). Let $\nu^*(f) = \sup_j |f * |\nu_j||$ and $\Phi^*(f) = \sup_j |f * \Phi_j(|F|, |\ell|)|$, where $\nu_j = \nu_j(F, \ell)$ as above. Note that

$$\begin{gathered}\nu^*(f) \le \mu^*(|f|) + \Phi^*(|f|) \le g(|f|) + 2\Phi^*(|f|), \\ \Phi^*(|f|) \le C(\log \rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1 Mf.\end{gathered}$$

These estimates and (4.8) along with the Hardy-Littlewood maximal theorem (see [1, 8, 13]) imply

$$\|\nu^*(f)\|_{p_m} \le CAB^{2/p_m}\|f\|_{p_m}. \tag{4.9}$$

Define r_m by $1/r_m - 1/2 = 1/(2p_m)$. Then by (4.9) and the estimate $\|\nu_j\|_1 \le CA$ we have the vector valued inequality (see [10] and also [21, 22])

$$\left\| \left(\sum |g_k * \nu_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{r_m} \le CAB^{1/p_m} \left\| \left(\sum |g_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{r_m}. \tag{4.10}$$

By the Littlewood-Paley theory (see Lemma 6) and (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_{r_m} &\le C \left\| \left(\sum_j |f * \Delta_{k_1+j} * \nu_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{r_m} \\ &\le CAB^{1/p_m} \left\| \left(\sum_j |f * \Delta_{k_1+j}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{r_m} \\ &\le CAB^{1/p_m} \|f\|_{r_m}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Interpolating between (4.5) and (4.11), since $1/p_{m+1} = (1-\theta)/r_m + \theta/2$, we see that

$$\|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_{p_{m+1}} \le CAB^{(1-\theta)/p_m} \prod_{i=1}^{2} \min(1, \rho^{-\theta\epsilon(|k_i|-c)/(2s')}) \|f\|_{p_{m+1}}. \tag{4.12}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_\sigma f\|_{p_{m+1}} &\le \sum_{k_1,k_2} \|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_{p_{m+1}} \\ &\le CAB^{(1-\theta)/p_m} (1 - \rho^{-\theta\epsilon/(2s')})^{-2} \|f\|_{p_{m+1}} \\ &\le CAB^{2/p_{m+1}} \|f\|_{p_{m+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.7) for all m by induction. For any $p \in (1+\theta, 2]$ there exists a positive integer j such that $p_{j+1} < p \le p_j$. So, interpolating between the estimates (4.7) with $m = j$ and $m = j+1$, we have

$$\|U_\sigma f\|_p \le CAB^{2/p} \|f\|_p. \tag{4.13}$$

Let $g(f)$ be as in (4.8). The estimate (4.13) implies $\|g(f)\|_p \le CAB^{2/p}\|f\|_p$ for $p \in (1+\theta, 2]$, from which Lemma 7 for $p \in (1+\theta, 2]$ follows, since $\mu^*(f) \le g(f) + \Phi^*(f)$. For $p > 2$ Lemma 7 follows from interpolation between the estimate for $p = 2$ of Lemma 7 and the estimate

$$\|\mu^*(f)\|_\infty \le C(\log\rho)\|\ell\|_{d_1}\|F\|_1\|f\|_\infty.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 7. □

Theorem 1 is an immediate consequence of the following result.

Lemma 8. *Let the functions* h, Ω *be as in Theorem* 1 *and put* $\delta(p) = |1/p - 1/p'|$. *Suppose that* $p \in (1+\theta, (1+\theta)/\theta)$. *Let* $A = (\log\rho)\|h\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|\Omega\|_s$ *and let* B *be as above*: $B = (1-\rho^{-\theta\epsilon/(2s')})^{-2}$. *Then*

$$\|Tf\|_p \le CAB^{1+\delta(p)}\|f\|_p,$$

where the constant C *is independent of* $s > 1$, Ω, h *and* $\rho \ge 2$.

Proof. Since $Tf = U_{\sigma^*}(K_0, h)(f)$, where $\sigma^* = \{\sigma_j\}$ with $\sigma_j = 1$ for all j, by (4.13) we have

$$\|Tf\|_p \le CAB^{2/p}\|f\|_p \quad \text{for } p \in (1+\theta, 2].$$

Now, a duality argument using a estimate similar to this one for $T^*f = U_{\sigma^*}(\tilde{K}_0, h)(f)$ will imply the conclusion for all $p \in (1+\theta, (1+\theta)/\theta)$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1. Take $\rho = 2^{s'}$ in Lemma 8. Then

$$\|Tf\|_p \le Cs'(1-2^{-\theta\epsilon/2})^{-2(1+\delta(p))}\|h\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|\Omega\|_s\|f\|_p$$

for $p \in (1+\theta, (1+\theta)/\theta)$ and $s > 1$. Since $(1+\theta, (1+\theta)/\theta) \to (1, \infty)$ as $\theta \to 0$, Theorem 1 follows from this estimate. ☐

5. Proof of Theorem 3

We need the following result to prove Theorem 3.

Lemma 9. *Let* h, Ω *be as in Theorem* 3. *Let* $\theta \in (0,1)$ *and* $A = (\log\rho)\|h\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|\Omega\|_s$. *We define*

$$R(f)(x) = \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\left|\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} f * S_jL(x)\right|,$$

where S_jL *is as in Section* 3. *Let* $I_\theta = (2(1+\theta)/(\theta^2-\theta+2), (1+\theta)/\theta)$. *Then, for* $p \in I_\theta$ *we have*

$$\|R(f)\|_p \le CA\left((1-\rho^{-\theta\delta/s'})^{-2(1+\delta(p))} + (1-\rho^{-\theta\delta/s'})^{-4/p-1-\theta}\right)\|f\|_p$$

with some $\delta > 0$, *where* C *is independent of* $s > 1$, $h \in \Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}$, $\Omega \in L^s(\Sigma)$ *and* ρ.

Proof. Let $\varphi_k = \sum_{m\ge k+2}\Delta_m = \delta_{\rho^{k+1}}\phi$. Using the decomposition

$$\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} f * S_jL = T(f) * \varphi_k - \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-1} f * S_jL\right) * \varphi_k + \left(\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} f * S_jL\right) * (\delta - \varphi_k),$$

we have

$$R(f) \le \sup_k |T(f) * \varphi_k| + \sup_k\left|\left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-1} f * S_jL\right) * \varphi_k\right| + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} N_j(f), \tag{5.1}$$

where $N_j(f) = \sup_k |(f * S_{j+k}L) * (\delta - \varphi_k)|$. Lemma 8 and the Hardy-Littlewood maximal theorem imply that

$$\left\|\sup_k |T(f) * \varphi_k|\right\|_p \le C\|M(Tf)\|_p \le CA(1-\rho^{-\theta\epsilon/(2s')})^{-2(1+\delta(p))}\|f\|_p \tag{5.2}$$

for $p \in (1+\theta, (1+\theta)/\theta)$. Also, Lemma 7 and the Hardy-Littlewood maximal theorem imply that

$$\|N_j(f)\|_u \le CA(1-\rho^{-\theta\epsilon/(2s')})^{-4/u}\|f\|_u \quad \text{for } u > 1+\theta. \tag{5.3}$$

On the other hand,

$$N_j(f) \le \left(\sum_k |f * S_{j+k}L * (\delta - \varphi_k)|^2\right)^{1/2}. \tag{5.4}$$

Let

$$V_\sigma f = \sum_k \sigma_k f * S_{j+k}L * (\delta - \varphi_k),$$

where $\sigma = \{\sigma_k\}$, $\sigma_k = 1$ or -1. We prove

$$\|V_\sigma f\|_2 \le CA(1-\rho^{-\delta/s'})^{-3}\min(1, \rho^{-\delta(j-c)/s'})\|f\|_2 \tag{5.5}$$

for some $\delta, c > 0$, uniformly in σ. Estimates (5.4) and (5.5) with Khintchine's inequality imply

$$\|N_j(f)\|_2 \le CA(1-\rho^{-\delta/s'})^{-3}\min(1, \rho^{-\delta(j-c)/s'})\|f\|_2. \tag{5.6}$$

To prove (5.5), we apply an argument similar to the one used to prove (4.5). We prove the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f * S_{j+k}L * (\delta - \varphi_k) * (\delta - \varphi_{k'}) * S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}\|_2 \\ &\le CA^2(1-\rho^{-\delta/s'})^{-2}\min(1, \rho^{-\delta(j-c)/s'})\min(1, \rho^{-\delta(|k-k'|-c)/s'})\|f\|_2, \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f * (\delta - \varphi_{k'}) * S_{j+k'}\tilde{L} * S_{j+k}L * (\delta - \varphi_k)\|_2 \\ &\le CA^2(1-\rho^{-\delta/s'})^{-4}\min(1, \rho^{-\delta(|k-k'|-c)/s'})\min(1, \rho^{-\delta(j-c)/s'})\|f\|_2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

for some $\delta, c > 0$, where $S_{j+k'}\tilde{L} = S_{j+k'}(\tilde{K}_0, h)$. By the Cotlar-Knapp-Stein lemma, the estimates (5.7) and (5.8) imply (5.5).

To prove (5.7), note that $\delta - \varphi_k = \sum_{m \le k+1} \Delta_m$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f * S_{j+k}L * (\delta - \varphi_k) * (\delta - \varphi_{k'}) * S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}\|_2 \\ &\le \sum_{m \le k+1, m' \le k'+1} \|f * S_{j+k}L * \Delta_m * \Delta_{m'} * S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}\|_2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

By Lemma 1 we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(5.10)\quad &\|f*(S_{j+k}L*\Delta_m)*(\Delta_{m'}*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L})\|_2\\ &\qquad \le CA^2\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k-m|-c)/s'})\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k'-m'|-c)/s'})\|f\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(5.11)\quad &\|f*S_{j+k}L*(\Delta_m*\Delta_{m'})*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}\|_2\\ &\qquad\qquad \le CA^2\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|m-m'|-c)})\|f\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

The estimates (5.10) and (5.11) imply

$$\begin{aligned}(5.12)\quad &\|f*S_{j+k}L*\Delta_m*\Delta_{m'}*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}\|_2\\ &\le CA^2\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k-m|-c)/(2s')})\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k'-m'|-c)/(2s')})\\ &\qquad\qquad \times\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|m-m'|-c)/2})\|f\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

By (5.9) and (5.12) we have (5.7).

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}(5.13)\quad &\|f*(\delta-\varphi_{k'})*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}*S_{j+k}L*(\delta-\varphi_k)\|_2\\ &\le \sum_{m\le k+1,m'\le k'+1}\|f*\Delta_{m'}*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}*S_{j+k}L*\Delta_m\|_2\\ &\le \sum_{m\le k+1,m'\le k'+1}\sum_{\ell,\ell'}\|f*\Delta_{m'}*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}*\Delta_\ell*\Delta_{\ell'}*S_{j+k}L*\Delta_m\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

(See [28, p. 1555] for the idea of interposing $\Delta_\ell*\Delta_{\ell'}$ in the convolution product.) By Lemma 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}(5.14)\quad &\|f*(\Delta_{m'}*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L})*(\Delta_\ell*\Delta_{\ell'})*(S_{j+k}L*\Delta_m)\|_2\\ &\le CA^2\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k'-m'|-c)/s'})\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k-m|-c)/s'})\\ &\qquad\qquad \times\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|\ell-\ell'|-c)})\|f\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}(5.15)\quad &\|f*\Delta_{m'}*(S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}*\Delta_\ell)*(\Delta_{\ell'}*S_{j+k}L)*\Delta_m\|_2\\ &\qquad \le CA^2\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k'-\ell|-c)/s'})\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k-\ell'|-c)/s'})\|f\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

By (5.14) and (5.15),

$$\begin{aligned}(5.16)\quad &\|f*\Delta_{m'}*S_{j+k'}\tilde{L}*\Delta_\ell*\Delta_{\ell'}*S_{j+k}L*\Delta_m\|_2\\ &\le CA^2\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k'-m'|-c)/(2s')})\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k-m|-c)/(2s')})\\ \times&\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|\ell-\ell'|-c)/2})\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k'-\ell|-c)/(2s')})\min(1,\rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k-\ell'|-c)/(2s')})\|f\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Summation with respect to ℓ, ℓ' in (5.16) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|f * \Delta_{m'} * S_{j+k'}\tilde{L} * S_{j+k}L * \Delta_m\|_2 &\le CA^2(1-\rho^{-\delta/s'})^{-2}\min(1, \rho^{-\delta(|k-k'|-c)/s'}) \\ &\quad \times \min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k'-m'|-c)/(2s')})\min(1, \rho^{-\epsilon(|j+k-m|-c)/(2s')})\|f\|_2\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

for some $\delta, c > 0$. By (5.13) and (5.17) we obtain (5.8).

For $p \in I_\theta$ we can find $u \in (1+\theta, 2(1+\theta)/\theta)$ such that $1/p = (1-\theta)/u + \theta/2$, so an interpolation between (5.3) and (5.6) implies that

$$\|N_j(f)\|_p \le CA(1-\rho^{-\theta\delta/s'})^{-4(1-\theta)/u-3\theta}\min(1, \rho^{-\theta\delta(j-c)/s'})\|f\|_p \tag{5.18}$$

for some $\delta, c > 0$.

Also, we need the following result.

Lemma 10. *There exist positive constants C, C_1 independent of ρ such that*

$$\left|\left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-1} S_jL\right) * \varphi_k(x)\right| \le C(\log\rho)\|h\|_{d_1}\|K_0\|_1\rho^{-(k+1)\gamma}\chi_{[0,C_1]}(\rho^{-k-1}r(x)).$$

Proof. Since $\int S_jL = 0$, for $j \le k-1$ we have

$$S_jL * \varphi_k(x) = \rho^{-(k+1)\gamma}\int \left(\phi(A_{\rho^{-k-1}}y^{-1}A_{\rho^{-k-1}}x) - \phi(A_{\rho^{-k-1}}x)\right) S_jL(y)\, dy.$$

Also, since $\operatorname{supp}(S_jL) \subset \{r(x) \le 2\rho^{j+2}\}$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi_k) \subset \{r(x) \le \rho^{k+1}\}$, it follows that $\operatorname{supp}(S_jL * \varphi_k) \subset \{r(x) \le C_1\rho^{k+1}\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}|S_jL * \varphi_k(x)| &\le C\rho^{-(k+1)\gamma}\chi_{[0,C_1]}(\rho^{-k-1}r(x))\int |A_{\rho^{-k-1}}y||S_jL(y)|\, dy \\ &\le C\rho^{-(k+1)\gamma}\chi_{[0,C_1]}(\rho^{-k-1}r(x))\rho^{(-k-1+j+2)/\beta_1}(\log\rho)\|h\|_{d_1}\|K_0\|_1.\end{aligned}$$

Thus summing over $j \le k-1$, we get the conclusion. □

By Lemma 10

$$\sup_k \left|f * \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{k-1} S_jL\right) * \varphi_k\right| \le C(\log\rho)\|h\|_{d_1}\|K_0\|_1 Mf. \tag{5.19}$$

So, to estimate the maximal function on the left hand side of (5.19), we can use the Hardy-Littlewood maximal theorem.

By (5.1), (5.2), (5.18) and (5.19), for $p \in I_\theta$ we have

$$\|R(f)\|_p \le CA\left((1-\rho^{-\theta\delta/s'})^{-2(1+\delta(p))} + (1-\rho^{-\theta\delta/s'})^{-4(1-\theta)/u-3\theta-1}\right)\|f\|_p$$

for some $\delta > 0$. This implies the conclusion of Lemma 9, since $4(1-\theta)/u + 3\theta + 1 = 4/p + 1 + \theta$. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Note that $T_*(f) \le 2R(f) + CM_{K_0,h}(|f|)$. Therefore, Lemma 7 and Lemma 9 imply that

$$\|T_*(f)\|_p \le C(\log\rho)\left(1-\rho^{-\theta\delta/s'}\right)^{-6}\|h\|_{\Lambda_s^{\eta/s'}}\|\Omega\|_s\|f\|_p$$

for $p \in I_\theta$ with some $\delta > 0$. Using this with $\rho = 2^{s'}$ and noting that $I_\theta \to (1,\infty)$ as $\theta \to 0$, we can get the conclusion of Theorem 3. □

6. Proof of Theorem 5

Let $M_{F,\ell}$ be as in Section 4. We prove Theorem 5 along with the following result.

Proposition 1. *Let $F \in L^q(D_0)$ and $\ell \in \Lambda_q^\eta$ for some $q > 1$ and $\eta > 0$. Let $1 < p < \infty$. Then, we have the following*:

1. *if $q' \le p < \infty$ and $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p/q'}$, the operator $M_{F,\ell}$ is bounded on $L^p(w)$*;
2. *the operator $M_{F,\ell}$ is bounded on $L^p(w^{1-p})$ if $1 < p \le q$ and $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p'/q'}$.*

We use results of Sections 3, 4 and 5 with $\rho = 2$. We also write $\|f\|_{L^p(w)} = \|f\|_{p,w}$. First, we prove results of Theorem 5 for T.

Proof of Proposition 1(1). Since $\|S_j(|F|,|\ell|)\|_q \le C2^{-j\gamma/q'}\|\ell\|_{d_q}\|F\|_q$, by the proof of Lemma 2, and $\mathrm{supp}(S_j(|F|,|\ell|)) \subset \{2^j \le r(x) \le 2^{j+3}\}$, Hölder's inequality implies that

$$M_{F,\ell}(f) \le C\|F\|_q\|\ell\|_{d_q}M_{q'}f,$$

where $M_{q'}f = \left(M(|f|^{q'})\right)^{1/q'}$. From this and the Hardy-Littlewood maximal theorem it follows that

$$\|M_{F,\ell}(f)\|_{p,w} \le C\|F\|_q\|\ell\|_{d_q}\left\|M_{q'}f\right\|_{p,w} \le C_{p,w}\|f\|_{p,w}$$

if $q' < p$ and $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p/q'}$.

Next, we handle the case $p = q' > 1$. Let $w \in \mathcal{A}_1$. If $s > q'$, then $w \in \mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}_{s/q'}$ and hence what we have already proved implies

$$\|M_{F,\ell}(f)\|_{s,w} \le C_{s,w}\|f\|_{s,w}. \tag{6.1}$$

If $1 < r < q'$, then by Lemma 7

$$\|M_{F,\ell}(f)\|_r \le C_r\|f\|_r. \tag{6.2}$$

Interpolating with change of measure between (6.2) and (6.1) with w replaced by $w^{1+\tau}$ for sufficiently small $\tau > 0$, we get

$$\|M_{F,\ell}(f)\|_{q',w} \le C_{q',w}\|f\|_{q',w}.$$

This proves Proposition 1 (1). □

Remark 1. If $q' < p$ in Proposition 1(1), then the assumption $\ell \in \Lambda^\eta$ is not needed. Also, we can replace the assumption for ℓ of Proposition 1 with the condition that there exists $\ell^* \in d_q$, $q > 1$, such that $|\ell| \le \ell^*$ and $\ell^* \in \Lambda^\eta$ for some $\eta > 0$, keeping the conclusion unchanged, since $M_{F,\ell}(f) \le M_{F,\ell^*}(|f|)$. In particular, if $\ell \in d_\infty$, we can take a constant function as ℓ^*.

Lemma 11. *Let $B_j f(x) = f * \nu_j(x)$, where $\nu_j = \nu_j(F, \ell)$, $F \in L^1(D_0)$, $\ell \in d_1$ (see (3.2)). Consider the inequality*

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |B_j f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w} \le C_{p,w} \left\| \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w}. \tag{6.3}$$

1. *Suppose that F and ℓ are as in Proposition 1. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. If (6.3) holds for some $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $w \in \mathcal{A}_p$, then $U_\sigma = U_\sigma(F,\ell)$ is bounded on $L^p(w^{1-\delta})$ uniformly in σ (see (3.2)).*
2. *If $M_{F,\ell}$ is bounded on $L^p(w)$ for some $1 < p \le 2$ and $w \in \mathcal{A}_p$, then (6.3) holds with these p and w.*

Proof. As in Section 4, we decompose U_σ of (1) as $U_\sigma f = \sum_{k_1,k_2} U_{k_1,k_2} f$. By (6.3) and Lemma 6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_{p,w} &\le C \left\| \left(\sum_j |f * \Delta_{k_1+j} * \nu_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w} \\ &\le C \left\| \left(\sum_j |f * \Delta_{k_1+j}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w} \\ &\le C \|f\|_{p,w}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

On the other hand, by the proof of Lemma 7 (see (4.12)) and duality we have

$$\|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_p \le C 2^{-\epsilon(|k_1|+|k_2|)} \|f\|_p \tag{6.5}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Interpolating with change of measure between (6.5) and (6.4), we see that

$$\|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_{p,w^{1-\delta}} \le C 2^{-\delta\epsilon(|k_1|+|k_2|)} \|f\|_{p,w^{1-\delta}}$$

for all $\delta \in (0,1)$. This implies that

$$\|U_\sigma f\|_{p,w^{1-\delta}} \le \sum_{k_1,k_2} \|U_{k_1,k_2} f\|_{p,w^{1-\delta}} \le C \|f\|_{p,w^{1-\delta}},$$

which proves part (1).

Suppose that $M_{F,\ell}$ is bounded on $L^p(w)$ for $1 < p \le 2$. Then

$$\left\| \left(\sum_j |M_{F,\ell} f_j|^p \right)^{1/p} \right\|_{p,w} \le C \left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^p \right)^{1/p} \right\|_{p,w} . \tag{6.6}$$

Also, we have

$$\left\| \sup_j |M_{F,\ell} f_j| \right\|_{p,w} \le C \left\| \sup_j |f_j| \right\|_{p,w} . \tag{6.7}$$

Interpolating between (6.6) and (6.7),

$$\left\| \left(\sum_j |M_{F,\ell} f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w} \le C \left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w} .$$

Now, (6.3) follows from this estimate and a vector valued inequality for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator (see [13, pp. 265–267], [20]). This proves part (2). □

Let $q \ge 2$. If $q' \le p \le 2$, $p > 1$, by Proposition 1 (1) and Lemma 11, U_σ is bounded on $L^p(w^{1-\delta})$ for $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p/q'}$, where $U_\sigma = U_\sigma(F, \ell)$ and F, ℓ satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 1. Replacing w by $w^{1+\tau}$ for sufficiently small $\tau > 0$ and taking δ suitably, we see that U_σ is bounded on $L^p(w)$. This boundedness also holds for $p \in (2, \infty)$ by the extrapolation theorem of Rubio de Francia [19]. If $1 < p \le q$, $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p'/q'}$, then this implies that U_σ is bounded on $L^{p'}(w)$. Obviously, this is also valid for $U_\sigma^* = U_\sigma(\tilde{F}, \ell)$. Therefore, by duality we can see that U_σ is bounded on $L^p(w^{1-p})$. Let Ω, h be as in Theorem 5. By taking $F = K_0$, $\ell = h$, $\sigma_j = 1$ for all j in the definition of U_σ, now we can see that Theorem 5 holds for T when $q \ge 2$.

Also, from a result of previous paragraph it follows that if $q \ge 2$, $1 < p \le q$, $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p'/q'}$ and F, ℓ are as in Proposition 1, then $M_{F,\ell}$ is bounded on $L^p(w^{1-p})$, since $M_{F,\ell} f \le g(f) + CMf$ by the proof of Lemma 7 and the boundedness of g follows from the uniform boundedness in σ of $U_\sigma = U_\sigma(|F|, |\ell|)$, where

$$g(f) = \left(\sum_j |f * \nu_j(|F|, |\ell|)|^2 \right)^{1/2} .$$

Here we recall that $\omega(|\ell|, t) \le \omega(\ell, t)$. This proves Proposition 1 (2) for $q \ge 2$.

It remains to prove Theorem 5 (for T) and Proposition 1 (2) when $1 < q < 2$.

Lemma 12. *Let* $1 < q < 2$, $2 < p < \infty$. *Let* $F \in L^q(D_0)$, $\ell \in d_q$. *If* $M_{|\tilde{F}|^{2-q},|\ell|^{2-q}}$ *is bounded on* $L^{(p/2)'}(w^{-(p/2-1)^{-1}})$ *and* $w \in \mathcal{A}_p$, *then*

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |B_j f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w} \le C_{p,w} \left\| \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w},$$

where B_j *is defined as in Lemma* 11 *by the functions* F, ℓ.

Proof. It suffices to prove the conclusion for B_j' in place of B_j, where $B_j' f = f * S_j(F,\ell)$, on account of a vector valued inequality for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. Take a non-negative function u in $L^{(p/2)'}(w)$ with norm 1 such that

$$\left\| \left(\sum_j |B_j' f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w}^2 = \int \left(\sum_j |B_j' f_j|^2 \right) u(x) w(x)\, dx. \tag{6.8}$$

We see that

$$|B_j' f(x)|^2 \le C \|\ell\|_{d_q}^q \|F\|_q^q (|f|^2 * S_j(|F|^{2-q}, |\ell|^{2-q}))(x). \tag{6.9}$$

This can be proved as follows. First, the Schwarz inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &|S_j(F,\ell)(x)|^2 \\ &\quad \le C \int_0^\infty \psi_j(t) |\ell(r(x)) \delta_t F(x)|^q \, dt/t \int_0^\infty \psi_j(t) |\ell(r(x)) \delta_t F(x)|^{2-q} \, dt/t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using

$$\int \int_0^\infty \psi_j(t) |\ell(r(x)) \delta_t F(x)|^q \, dt/t \, dx \le C 2^{j\gamma(1-q)} \|\ell\|_{d_q}^q \|F\|_q^q,$$

again by the Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|f * S_j(F,\ell)(x)|^2 \\ &\le C 2^{j\gamma(1-q)} \|\ell\|_{d_q}^q \|F\|_q^q \int \int_0^\infty \psi_j(t) |f(y)|^2 |\ell(r(y^{-1}x)) \delta_t F(y^{-1}x)|^{2-q} \, dt/t \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (6.9). Therefore, the integral in (6.8) is majorized by

$$C \|\ell\|_{d_q}^q \|F\|_q^q \int \left(\sum_j |f_j(y)|^2 \right) M_{|\tilde{F}|^{2-q},|\ell|^{2-q}}(uw)(y) \, dy. \tag{6.10}$$

By Hölder's inequality, the integral in (6.10) is bounded by

$$\left\| \left(\sum_j |f_j|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p,w}^2 \left(\int \left| M_{|\tilde{F}|^{2-q},|\ell|^{2-q}}(uw)(y) \right|^{(p/2)'} w^{-(2/p)(p/2)'}(y) \, dy \right)^{1/(p/2)'}.$$

Since $-(2/p)(p/2)' = -(p/2-1)^{-1}$, from the boundedness of $M_{|\tilde{F}|^{2-q},|\ell|^{2-q}}$ the last integral is majorized, up to a constant factor, by

$$\int |u(y)w(y)|^{(p/2)'} w^{-(2/p)(p/2)'}(y)\,dy = \|u\|_{(p/2)',w}^{(p/2)'} = 1.$$

Collecting results, we get the conclusion. □

Let $c_n = 1-(1/2)^n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Suppose that $q^{-1} \in (c_n, c_{n+1}]$, $n \geq 1$. Put $r = q/(2-q)$. Then $(2r)^{-1} = q^{-1} - 1/2$, $r^{-1} \in (c_{n-1}, c_n]$. For $n \geq 1$, we consider the following:

Assertion $A(n)$**.** *Theorem* 5 *for* T *and Proposition* 1 (2) *hold when* $q^{-1} \in (c_{n-1}, c_n]$.

Assuming Proposition 1 (2) when $q^{-1} \in (c_{n-1}, c_n]$, we prove $A(n+1)$ ($n \geq 1$). This will prove Theorem 5 for T and Proposition 1 (2) when $1 < q < 2$, since we have already proved $A(1)$.

Suppose that $q^{-1} \in (c_n, c_{n+1}]$, $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p/q'}$, $q' \leq p < \infty$. Then, $(p/2)' \leq (q'/2)' = q/(2-q) = r$. Let F, ℓ satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 1. Since $r^{-1} \in (c_{n-1}, c_n]$, $p/q' = (p/2)/r'$, $-(p/2-1)^{-1} = 1-(p/2)'$ and $|\ell|^{2-q} \in d_r$, $\omega(|\ell|^{2-q}, t) \leq C\omega(\ell, t)^{2-q}$, $|F|^{2-q} \in L^r(D_0)$, by what we assume ($A(n)$ for Proposition 1 (2)), $M_{|\tilde{F}|^{2-q},|\ell|^{2-q}}$ is bounded on $L^{(p/2)'}(w^{-(p/2-1)^{-1}})$. By Lemmas 11 and 12, $U_\sigma = U_\sigma(F, \ell)$ is bounded on $L^p(w^{1-\delta})$. From this, boundedness of U_σ on $L^p(w)$ follows as before. This implies $A(n+1)$ for Theorem 5 (1) concerning T as in the case when $q \geq 2$.

Suppose that $1 < p \leq q$, $w \in \mathcal{A}_{p'/q'}$. Then, since $q' \leq p'$, by a result in the previous paragraph, U_σ is bounded on $L^{p'}(w)$. We can see that the same is true for U_σ^*. By duality U_σ is bounded on $L^p(w^{1-p})$. This implies the boundedness on $L^p(w^{1-p})$ of T and $M_{F,\ell}$ as in the case for $q \geq 2$. This finishes proving $A(n+1)$, and hence completes the proof of Theorem 5 for T and Proposition 1.

Next, we prove Theorem 5 for T_*. Let Ω, h, p, q, w be as in Theorem 5 (1). By (5.1), Lemma 10 and Theorem 5 for T, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R(f)\|_{p,w} &\leq C\|M(Tf)\|_{p,w} + C\|Mf\|_{p,w} + C\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\|N_j(f)\|_{p,w} \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{p,w} + C\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\|N_j(f)\|_{p,w}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

Since $N_j(f) \leq CMM_{K_0,h}(|f|)$,

$$\|N_j(f)\|_{p,w} \leq C\|f\|_{p,w} \tag{6.12}$$

by Proposition 1. By (5.3) and (5.6)

$$\|N_j(f)\|_p \leq C2^{-\epsilon j}\|f\|_p \tag{6.13}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. So, interpolating with change of measure between (6.13) and (6.12) with $w^{1+\tau}$ in place of w for sufficiently small $\tau > 0$, we have

$$\|N_j(f)\|_{p,w} \le C2^{-\epsilon j}\|f\|_{p,w} \tag{6.14}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Since $T_*(f) \le CR(f) + CM_{K_0,h}(|f|)$, by (6.11), (6.14) and Proposition 1 we have the $L^p(w)$ boundedness of T_*. This proves Theorem 5 (1). Theorem 5 (2) can be proved similarly.

7. Proof of Theorem 2

We give a proof of Theorem 2 by applying Theorem 1. Define

$$E_m = \{\theta \in \Sigma : 2^{m-1} < |\Omega(\theta)| \le 2^m\}$$

for $m = 2, 3, \dots$ and

$$E_1 = \{\theta \in \Sigma : |\Omega(\theta)| \le 2\}.$$

Let $\Omega_m = \Omega\chi_{E_m} - S(\Sigma)^{-1}\int_{E_m}\Omega\, dS$. Then $\int_\Sigma \Omega_m\, dS = 0$, $\Omega = \sum_{m=1}^\infty \Omega_m$.

Fix $p \in (1,\infty)$ and an appropriate function f with $\|f\|_p \le 1$. Write $U(h,\Omega) = \|Tf\|_p$, where $Tf = \text{p.v.}\, f * L$, $L(x) = h(r(x))\Omega(x')r(x)^{-\gamma}$. Since $h \in \Lambda$, we can write $h = \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k h_k$, where $\{a_k\}$ and h_k are as in the definition of the space Λ. Then, we decompose

$$h\Omega = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} a_k h_k \Omega_m + \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k h_k \Omega_m\right). \tag{7.1}$$

By the subadditivity of U and Theorem 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} U\left(\sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} a_k h_k, \Omega_m\right) &\le \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} a_k U\left(h_k, \Omega_m\right) \\ &\le C\sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} k a_k \|h_k\|_{\Lambda_{1+1/k}^{1/(1+k)}}\|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/k} \\ &\le C\sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} k a_k \|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/m} \le C\|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/m}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

since $\|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/k} \le C\|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/m}$ if $k > m$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} U\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k h_k, \Omega_m\right) &\le \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k U\left(h_k, \Omega_m\right) \\ &\le C\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k m \|h_k\|_{\Lambda_{1+1/m}^{1/(1+m)}}\|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/m} \\ &\le C\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k m \|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/m} \le Cm\|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/m}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

since $\|h_k\|_{\Lambda^{1/(1+m)}_{1+1/m}} \le C\|h_k\|_{\Lambda^{1/(1+k)}_{1+1/k}} \le C$ if $k \le m$.

Note that

$$\|\Omega_m\|_u \le C2^m e_m^{1/u}, \quad 1 \le u < \infty,$$

where $e_m = S(E_m)$. Using this and applying Young's inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(7.4)\qquad \sum_{m\ge1} m\|\Omega_m\|_{1+1/m} &\le C\sum_{m\ge1} m2^m e_m^{m/(m+1)} \\ &\le 2C\sum_{m\ge1}(m/(m+1))m2^{m(1+1/m)}e_m + 2C\sum_{m\ge1} m2^{-m-1}/(m+1) \\ &\le C\sum_{m\ge1} m2^m e_m + C \le C\int_\Sigma |\Omega(\theta)|\log(2+|\Omega(\theta)|)\,dS(\theta) + C.\end{aligned}$$

Theoerm 2 follows from (7.1), (7.2), (7.3) and (7.4).

Remark 2. Let $\mathcal{M}_a$, $a > 0$, be the family of functions h on $\mathbb{R}_+$ such that there exist a sequence $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of non-negative real numbers satisfying $h = \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k h_k$, $h_k \in d_{1+1/k}$, $\|h_k\|_{d_{1+1/k}} \le 1$ uniformly in $k \ge 1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^\infty k^a a_k < \infty$. Then, the space $\mathcal{M}_1$ can be used to form kernels of singular integrals with a minimum size condition that allows us to get L^p boundedness of singular integrals defined by the kernels from results of [21, 22] (see [24]).

REFERENCES

[1] A. P. Calderón, *Inequalities for the maximal function relative to a metric*, Studia Math. **57** (1976), 297–306.

[2] A. P. Calderón and A. Torchinsky, *Parabolic maximal functions associated with a distribution*, Advances in Math. **16** (1975), 1–64.

[3] A. P. Calderón and A. Zygmund, *On singular integrals*, Amer. J. Math. **78** (1956), 289–309.

[4] Y. Chen, Y. Ding and D. Fan, *A parabolic singular integral operator with rough kernel*, J. Aust. Math. Soc. **84** (2008), 163–179.

[5] M. Christ, *Hilbert transforms along curves I. Nilpotent groups*, Ann. of Math. **122** (1985), 575–596.

[6] R. R. Coifman and C. Fefferman, *Weighted norm inequalities for maximal functions and singular integrals*, Studia Math. **51** (1974), 241–250.

[7] R. R. Coifman and Y. Meyer, *Au delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels*, Astérisque no. 57, Soc. Math. France, 1978.

[8] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse Harmonique Non-Commutative sur Certains Espaces Homogenes*, Lecture Notes in Math. 242, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1971.

[9] J. Duoandikoetxea, *Weighted norm inequalities for homogeneous singular integrals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **336** (1993), 869–880.

[10] J. Duoandikoetxea and J. L. Rubio de Francia, *Maximal and singular integral operators via Fourier transform estimates*, Invent. Math. **84** (1986), 541–561.

[11] E. B. Fabes and N. Rivière, *Singular integrals with mixed homogeneity*, Studia Math. **27** (1966), 19–38.

[12] D. Fan and S. Sato, *Weighted weak type* $(1,1)$ *estimates for singular integrals and Littlewood-Paley functions*, Studia Math. **163** (2004), 119–136.

[13] I. Genebashvili, A. Gogatishvili, V. Kokilashvili, and M. Krbec, *Weight theory for integral transforms on spaces of homogeneous type*, Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Appl. Math. 92, Addison Wesley Longman, 1998.

[14] A. Nagel, N. Rivière and S. Wainger, *On Hilbert transforms along curves, II*, Amer. J. Math. **98** (1976), 395–403.

[15] A. Nagel and E. M. Stein, *Lectures on pseudo-differential operators*, Mathematical Notes 24, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1979.

[16] F. Ricci and E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis on nilpotent groups and singular integrals, I. Oscillatory integrals*, J. Func. Anal. **73** (1987), 179–194.

[17] F. Ricci and E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis on nilpotent groups and singular integrals, II. Singular kernels supported on submanifolds*, J. Func. Anal. **78** (1988), 56–84.

[18] N. Rivière, *Singular integrals and multiplier operators*, Ark. Mat. **9** (1971), 243–278.

[19] J.L. Rubio de Francia, Factorization theory and A_p weights, Amer. J. Math. **106** (1984), 533–547.

[20] J. L. Rubio de Francia, F. J. Ruiz and J. L. Torrea, *Calderón-Zygmund theory for operator-valued kernels*, Adv. in Math. **62** (1986), 7–48.

[21] S. Sato, *Estimates for singular integrals and extrapolation*, Studia Math. **192** (2009), 219–233.

[22] S. Sato, *Estimates for singular integrals along surfaces of revolution*, J. Aust. Math. Soc. **86** (2009), 413–430.

[23] S. Sato, *Weak type* $(1,1)$ *estimates for parabolic singular integrals*, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (to appear).

[24] S. Sato, *A note on* L^p *estimates for singular integrals*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **71** (2010), 343–348.

[25] A. Seeger, *Singular integral operators with rough convolution kernels*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), 95–105.

[26] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis*: *Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[27] E. M. Stein and S. Wainger, *Problems in harmonic analysis related to curvature*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **84** (1978), 1239–1295.

[28] T. Tao, *The weak-type* $(1,1)$ *of* $L\log L$ *homogeneous convolution operator*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **48** (1999), 1547–1584.

[29] D. Watson, *Weighted estimates for singular integrals via Fourier transform estimates*, Duke Math. J. **60** (1990), 389–399.

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, Kanazawa University, Kanazawa 920-1192, Japan
E-mail address: `shuichi@kenroku.kanazawa-u.ac.jp`